



King County

Commission on Governance

A G E N D A - Meeting 10

Thursday, July 31, 2003, 2:00 to 5:00 p.m.
Lydia Catherine Room, 2nd Floor, King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, WA

<u>When</u>	<u>What/Objective</u>	<u>Who</u>
2:00 p.m.	Approval of July 17 Meeting Summary Welcome new Commission members	Dave Gering
2:15 p.m.	Discussion with Cities of King County <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services to be provided by King County • Levels of service and how County services are provided • Work plan comments 	Diane Carlson, Intergovernmental Relations Director, City of Bellevue Deb Eddy, Executive Director, Suburban Cities Association Rose Feliciano, Regional Affairs Coordinator, City of Seattle
3:00 p.m.	Discussion with Unincorporated Area Councils <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services to be provided by King County • Levels of service and how County services are provided • Work plan comments 	Jim English, President, Vashon-Maury Island UAC Kathleen Royer, President. West Hill UAC Dick Bonewits, Chair, Maple Valley UAC David Rockabrand President, Four Creeks UAC (tentative)
3:45 p.m.	Develop Problem Statement: From each Commissioner's perspective, what is the problem the Commission's work is addressing?	Dave Gering Discussion: All (Marty Wine, facilitator)
4:15 p.m.	Division of Service Responsibilities among King County jurisdictions – issues, advantages, disadvantages (Time Permitting)	Discussion: All (Marty Wine: briefing)
4:45 p.m.	Administrative Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications Strategy • Discussion: Draft letter to the editor • August 14 meeting overview 	Bill Ptacek Steve Goldblatt Dave Gering
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

King County Governance Commission

July 31, 2003 meeting

Reading Packet (to be distributed at the meeting):

To provide context for meetings 11-12 discussion the services to be provided by King County, context about the role and scope of services of counties nationwide:

- Excerpt from Municipal Research Services Council's New Commissioner Handbook, Chapter 2, Structure and Composition of County Government
- Changes and Challenges in the New Millenium, Rural County Governance Center, Research Report No. 1, July 2001

To prepare for August 28 meeting regarding criminal justice issues, executive summaries from:

- Adult Justice Operational Master Plan (AJOMP)
- Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan (JJOMP)

To prepare for the Phase 2 question of changes, if any, to employment practices:

- Public Labor Policies, adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council
- Copy of presentation by Kathi Oglesby, Executive Labor Liaison, Office of King County Executive and Dave Gaba, Labor Relations, King County, at the Budget Advisory Task Force's January 2002 meeting

Press/articles since July 17 relevant to the Governance Commission's work

Clarifying e-mail from Karen Reed to Commission members about the calculation of sales tax and how it is counted as "regional" or "local" revenue

Services to be Provided by King County Governance Commission Discussion Guide July 31, 2003

Purpose: Start thinking about and discussing the Phase 1 question to develop recommendations by August 28.

Whether or not the services/service areas historically funded should be provided to the public by King County and, of those services determined by the Commission as not being appropriate for King County to provide, whether or not those services should be provided by another entity, be it public, nonprofit or private. The Commission is not charged with identifying what other specific governmental jurisdictions or other entities should be responsible for providing specific services.

(Source: Paraphrased from Ordinance 14514 to include all funds)

Background/Context

"Over the years, the three types of local governments in Washington - counties, cities, and special purpose districts - began to acquire overlapping powers and responsibilities, and their roles have become more similar. Although the similarity of roles has led to some conflict and competition among the local governments, a variety of forms of cooperation between them has also evolved. The range of methods for local inter-governmental cooperation is another distinctive feature of Washington State government. The development of informal interlocal cooperation may also explain the lack of formal regional units of government in Washington State.

After a century of increasingly blurring the distinction between counties and cities, the legislature in the 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA) recognized that counties are the regional governments within their boundaries and that cities are the primary providers of urban governmental services within urban growth areas (RCW 36.70A.210). The GMA requires cooperative planning between counties and cities subject to the GMA. In 1994, the legislature passed the Local Government Service Agreements Act, Chapter 36.115 RCW, further encouraging voluntary transfers of functional responsibility among units of local government to allocate the financing and provision government services and facilities using the most efficient geographic units regardless of jurisdictional boundaries."

(Source: Municipal Research Services Center Governance Page,
<http://www.mrsc.org/Subjects/Governance/locgov2.aspx#2>)

Discussion Questions:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the division of these service responsibilities among different levels of governments?
- What functions should be provided by King County and funded by the Current Expense Fund? By other funds?
- Agree/disagree with categorization of services by mandatory/discretionary, regional/local services?

- If there is flexibility to change those categories, what should the County continue to do or no longer do? What are the implications of those decisions?
- If categories are as givens and most of County functions are mandatory, what could the County do to prioritize these services to help address the funding crisis? (Relates directly to Phase 2 question of level of service or how services are to be provided.)

Mandatory/Discretionary Functions of Cities and Counties: Services to be Provided by King County

(M=Mandatory, D=Discretionary, Blank= Jurisdiction does not have authority to perform the activity or not a significant activity for that class of jurisdiction.)

Service	City	County	Is this a service King County should be responsible for providing to the public?
Public Health		M	
Juvenile Detention and Courts		M	
Juvenile Probation		D	
Youth Services	D	D	
Hospital	D	D	
Veteran's Programs	D	M	
Cooperative Extension		D	
Mental Health		M	
Developmental Disabilities		M	
Arts	D	D	
Courts	M	M	
Adult Detention Pretrial	M	M	
Adult Detention Felons		M	
Public Safety (Crimes)	M	M	
Traffic Enforcement	M	M	
Public Defense	M	M	
Attorney (City/County Cases)	M	M	
Airport	D	D	
Roads	M	M	
Surface Water	M	M	
Solid Waste Collection	D		
Solid Waste Disposal	D	D	
Sewage Collection	D	D	
Sewage Treatment	D	D	
Planning (GMA)	M	M	
Land Use Controls (GMA)	M	M	
Boundary Review Boards		M (D in small counties)	
Parks and Recreation	D	D	
County Fair		D	
Building/Fire Code	M	M	
Fire Suppression	D		

Service	City	County	Is this a service King County should be responsible for providing to the public?
Historic Preservation	D	D	
Community Development	D	D	
Stadium	D	D	
Water Supply	D	D	
Electric Energy	D		
Licensing	D	M	
Workmen's Compensation	M	M	
Budget	M	M	
Auditor		M	
Elections		M	
Administrative Support	D	D	
Finance/Treasurer	M	M	
Executive	M	M	
Legislative Council	M	M	
Assessor		M	
Animal Control	D	D	
Library	D	D	
Involuntary Treatment		M	
Emergency Medical Services	D	D	
Medical Examiner		M	
Air Pollution	M	M	
Public Transportation	D	D	
Employment and Training	D	D	
Cemetery	D		



King County Commission on Governance – *Draft* Schedule and Agenda Planner

(Meeting Room after July 31 to be determined)

Mtg #	Day	Date	Time	Proposed Agenda		
6	Fri	June 6	1-4 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workshop - Work Plan, best study outcomes• Councilmember briefing (Irons)• Administrative items		
7	Thu	June 19	1-3 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Permanent chair/vice chair• Councilmember briefings (McKenna, Lambert)• Administrative items		
Work Plan due to Council by June 30						
Phase 1: CX Services to be Provided by King County						
8	Mon	July 7	3-5 p.m.	Guests <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chandler Felt, County Demographer	Briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demographic Profile• BATF Update	Discussion
9	Thu	July 17 Maynard Room	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• King County BATF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Services the County provides• Criminal Justice• Charter review history/	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Priorities for service discussion• BATF Recommendations• Quarterly Council Report
10	Thu	July 31 Lydia-Catherine Room	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• City of Seattle• City of Bellevue• Suburban Cities Association• Unincorporated Area Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communications Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft problem statement• Advantages and disadvantages of division of service responsibilities among jurisdictions (tentative)
11	Thu	August 14 Room TBD	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• League of Women Voters	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regional, unincorporated & other service provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Service focus for remaining phases• Problem statement part 2

Mtg #	Day	Date	Time	Proposed Agenda		
12	Thu	August 28	2-5 p.m.	Guests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councilmember Larry Gossett • Criminal Justice Council • Non profit service providers • Reform efforts 	Briefings	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclude: What services should the County provide? • Draft problem statement
Phase 2: How Services Will Be Provided to Ensure Long-Term Efficiency/Accountability						
13	Thu	September 11	2-5 p.m.	Guests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments related to service focus 	Briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I: Service delivery best practices 	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I: Application of best practice models (other areas)
14	Thu	September 25	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments related to service focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II: Service delivery best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II: Best practice models (other areas)
Public Meeting to be held by October 1, 2003 on Phase 1 findings						
15	Thu	October 9	2-5 p.m.	Guests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Labor Relations Team 	Briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracting out 	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Council Report • Part I: Labor policy • Contracting out
16	Thu	October 23	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Labor Relations Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BATF Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II: Labor policy
17	Thu	November 6	2-5 p.m.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part III: Labor policy • Draft findings on current employment and labor policies • Part I: Changes to service delivery
18	Thu	November 20	2-5 p.m.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II: Changes to service delivery • Draft findings on proposed changes to service • Revise problem statement

Mtg #	Day	Date	Time	Proposed Agenda		
Public Meeting to be Held by December 1, 2003 on Phase 2 findings						
Phase 3: How Services Should be Paid For; CX and dedicated revenue sources						
19	Thu	December 4	2-5 p.m.	Guests	Briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cross subsidization of unincorporated areas	Discussion
20	Thu	January 8	12-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Steve Call (Budget Office)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revenue source assessment• Regional Financing Mechanisms Best Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retreat: bring it all together• Quarterly Council Report• Regional financing mechanisms• Draft findings re: revenue sufficiency, structure and dedication for services and level of service
21	Thu	January 22	2-5 p.m.			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop first draft of report
Public Meeting to be Held in Late January on Phase 3 findings						
Phase 4: Changes to Governance Structure and Governance Policies						
22	Thu	February 5	2-5 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Part I: Governance Best Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop recommendations re: partisanship, elected/appointed status, size and structure of governance
Public Meeting to be Held in Early February on Governance Issues						
23	Thu	February 19	12-5 p.m.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Part II: Governance Best Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed Retreat for draft recommendations
24	Thu	March 4	2-5 p.m.			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review Draft Report
25	Thu	March 18	2-5 p.m.			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review Final Report



King County
Commission on Governance

August 4, 2003

REVISED DRAFT

Transmitted by email: opinion@seattletimes.com

Letters Editor, The Seattle Times
P.O. Box 70
Seattle, WA 98111

Editor, the Times:

King County Initiative 18 ("Court to weigh in", July 26) is not the answer to the County's budget woes. Every taxpayer dollar is precious, yet the savings generated would hardly make more than a token dent in the County's budget. Law, safety, and justice costs account for 72% of the County's 2003 general fund spending. The Council's share is 2.5%, and the likely annual savings would be less than 0.5%.

The King County Commission on Governance may indeed recommend that Council seats contract from 13 to 9, but we wouldn't do so primarily as a cost-saving device. Such a recommendation would come next spring out of the Commission's comprehensive look at County governance, from the last of our 4 phases of work.

So Council size matters, just not very much.

Sincerely,
King County Commission on Governance

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Dave Gering".

Dave Gering
Co-Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Steve Goldblatt".

Steve Goldblatt
Co-Chair



Communications Plan and Strategy – DISCUSSION DRAFT
July 31, 2003

1. Communications Goal

- To inform the general public and stakeholder groups of the Commission's process and report.
- To receive sufficient information to make effective decisions in the report.

2. Desired Outcome: A credible report to elected leaders and the public.

3. Methods to Achieve the Goal

- a. **Regular Commission meetings.** The Commission's regular meetings occur every other Thursday and are open to the public.
- b. **Four public meetings throughout King County.** Details about these meetings are outlined in items 5, 6, and 7 of this strategy, below.
- c. **Problem statements to focus the discussion.** By the end of Phase 1, the Commission will develop a statement of the problem it is addressing in its work, which will be presented at public meetings to frame the discussion.
- d. **Research to support Commission and public dialogue.** The Commission's work will integrate research and analysis with stakeholder perspectives and best practices nationally, to develop a holistic, systems approach to its recommendations.
- e. **Input from targeted groups and individuals.** Details about the Commission's approach are outlined in item 4, below.
- f. **King County press mechanisms and personalized media contacts.** The Commission has protocols for interactions with the media, including the co-chairs and spokespersons for the Commission and coordination with the consultant project manager. The Commission will seek the support of King County's media relations staff to distribute information to the press. From time to time, the co-chairs of the Commission will personally contact members of the media or draft opinion and editorial statements for distribution to the press on issues relevant to the Commission.
- g. **Presentations to the Metropolitan King County Council.** The King County Council's Committee-of-the-Whole will be briefed quarterly in writing, in keeping with the intent of Ordinance 14514, or at the invitation of the Council.
- h. **Keep website current and interactive.** The Commission has established a website, <http://www.metrokc.gov/MKCC/governance/>, to which all pertinent meeting information will be posted. An electronic

mailbox has also been established, governance@berkandassociates.com, where any member of the public can address the Commission, or queries and requests for information can be made. Correspondence from this site will be provided to the Commission at their next scheduled meeting. An e-mail distribution list has been developed for conveyance of meeting notices.

4. Outreach effort

- a. **Major media, community and cable communications.** For public meetings, attendance and coverage by the region's print media, radio and TV stations, and public cable stations will be sought to keep the Commission's work visible. Quarterly press releases will be prepared in conjunction with the Commission's reports to the County Council. The press releases will feature the Commission's work accomplished to-date, key findings and recommendations, and upcoming activities or actions.
- b. **Key customers, groups, elected officials.** The Commission invites individuals and groups to come talk with the Commission to define the problem and key issues, including proposed options for addressing them, and welcomes information that specifically addresses the work plan phases (services King County should provide, level of service and employment policy issues, how services should be funded, and governance issues). Input, perspectives and feedback will be sought from customers of King County; Unincorporated Area Councils; the Suburban Cities Association and individual cities, other governmental entities (including the Port of Seattle, library, fire and hospital districts), the Municipal League and League of Women Voters, non-profit service providers and associations, and political parties.
- c. **Web casting of public meetings.** For each of the four public meetings, the Commission intends to make use of the I-NET system to broaden outreach and opportunities for public comment. The I-NET system allows for virtual public meetings from locations throughout the County.

5. Format of public hearings

- a. **Overview/introduction.** Public input to the full Commission is an important component of the Commission's work. The Commission will host four public meetings – one at the conclusion of each project phase. Each public meeting will be held in a different location within the County, at an accessible location such as city council chambers, libraries, community centers, etc., in an effort to obtain the broadest citizen participation possible. The public meeting schedule will be posted on the project web site and notice will be published as part of the public outreach effort.
- b. **Meeting format** will include:

- A short presentation about the Commission's view of the problem statement to frame the discussion.
- 30-minute open house session prior to public hearing.
- Public testimony with time allocated to each member of the public who wishes to address the Commission;
- Summaries of testimony; and
- Input sheets or written forms to collect public comments.

6. **Schedule and timetable**

The Commission's goal is to make its recommendations to the Metropolitan King County Council, the King County Executive, and the residents of King County by March 31, 2004. The Commission's regular meetings occur every other Thursday and are open to the public. Public meetings at the end of each of four phases are planned as follows:

- **Phase 1.** Complete a plan for a public outreach effort and public meetings to collect perspectives from the citizens of King County. Schedule a public hearing to be held by **October 1, 2003**, to receive comments on Phase 1 findings, and publicize it through an outreach effort that disseminates draft findings for Phase 1.
- **Phase 2.** Conduct public hearing to gain feedback on Phase 2 (service) findings by **December 1, 2003**.
- **Phase 3.** Hold a public hearing on Phase 3 draft (funding) findings by **January 31, 2004**. Develop first draft of proposed final report based on findings from Phases 1, 2, and 3.
- **Phase 4.** Public hearing on governance issues in **early February 2004**.

7. **Record of Testimony**

A record will be kept of public interaction/testimony for each of the regular Commission meetings and the 4 public meetings. It is the intention of the Commission that the input received at each of the public meetings will be used by the Commission in developing its recommendations, and documented for the final report.